S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XV.

PARS II.
De missione Filii et Spiritus sancti quantum ad modum, qui duplex est, visibilis scilicet et invisibilis.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio I.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 269-271.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Hic quaeritur, utrum semel tantum sit missus Filius.

DIVISIO TEXTUS.

Supra egit Magister de missione quantum ad *principium*, hic agit de ea quantum ad *modum*, qui duplex est, scilicet visibilis et invisibilis. Et quoniam isti modi conveniunt missioni Filii et Spiritus sancti, ideo Magister *primo* assignat eos circa missionem Filii; *secundo* circa missionem Spiritus sancti, infra in principio decimae sextae distinctionis: *Nunc de Spiritu sancto videndum est* etc.

Prima pars habet quatuor partes. In prima[3] ostendit auctoritate Augustini, quod Filius duobus modis missus est, scilicet visibiliter in invisibiliter. In secunda assignat duplicem differentiam istorum duorum modorum,[4] ibi: *Ecce distincti sunt duo modo missionis Filii*. In tertia vero movet dubium quoddam, quod habet ortum ex

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XV

PART II
On the mission of the Son and of the Holy Spirit as much as regards its manner, which is twofold, namely, the visible and invisible.

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 1

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 269-271.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Here there is asked, whether the Son has been sent only once etc..

DIVISION OF THE TEXT

Above Master (Peter) deals with mission as much as regards (its) *principle*, here he deals with it as much as regards (its) *manner*, which is twofold, namely, visible and invisible. And since these two manners befit the mission of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, for that reason Master (Peter) *first* assigns them to [circa] the mission of the Son; *second* to the mission of the Holy Spirit, below at the beginning of the sixteenth Distinction: *Now concerning the Holy Spirit there must be seen* etc..

The *first* part has four parts. In the first[3] he shows by the authority of (St.) Augustine, that the Son has been sent in two manners, that is in one visible and in one invisible. In the second he assigns a twofold difference for these two manners,[4] there (where he says): *Behold, the two manners of the mission of the Son have been distinguished*.

praedeterminatis, ibi: *Hic quaeritur, cur Pater non dicitur missus*. In quarta vero removet sive docet errorem cavere, procedentem ex illius dubii solutione, ibi: *Ideoque putaverunt quidam haeretici*. Ex hoc enim, quod dixerat, Patrem non mitti, posset quis credere, in divinis non esse aequalitatem. Ad hoc respondes Magister dicit, quod hoc non est propter inaequalitatem, sed propter principii auctoritatem sive connotationem.

In the third, however, he moves a certain doubt, which has its rise from the predetermined, there (where he says): *Here there is asked, why is the Father not said (to be) sent*. In the fourth, however, he removes or teaches one to beware of the error, proceeding from the solution of that doubt, there (where he says): *And for that reason certain heretics thought*. For from this, that he had said, that the Father is not sent, someone might believe, that He is not an equal among the Divine (Persons). To this Master (Peter), responding, says, that this is not on account of inequality, but on account of the authorship or connotation of a "principle".

TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM.

Ad intelligentiam eorum quae dicuntur in parte ista, tria quaeruntur de missione Filii invisibili, quia de visibili agetur in tertio. Et quia missio invisibilis Filii similis est missioni invisibili Spiritus sancti, ideo simul quaeritur de utraque.

Primo quaeritur, utrum haec missio sit secundum dona gratiae gratum facientis, vel gratiae gratis datae.

Secundo quaeritur, utrum secundum eadem dona gratiae dicatur mitti Filius et Spiritus sanctus.

Tertio, utrum utraque missio sit secundum eadem dona gratiae augmentata.

TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS

For an understanding of those (things) which are said in this part (of his), three (things) are asked concerning the visible mission of the Son, because the visible is dealt with in (the) third (chapter of Part II). And because the invisible mission of the Son is similar to the invisible mission of the Holy Spirit, for that reason it is at once asked of each.

First there is asked, whether this mission is according to gifts of the grace which makes one pleasing [dona gratie gratum facientis], and/or of the grace freely given [gratiae gratis datae].

Second there is asked, whether the Son and the Holy Spirit are said "to be sent" according to the same gifts of grace.

Third, whether each mission is augmented according to the same gifts of grace

---

[3] Fide mss. et ed. 1 removimus verba *praemissa quaestione*, quae Vat. hic addit.
[4] In Vat. hic additur *unam*, ex mox post *Filii* adiungitur *Aliam ibi: Praeterea notandum*; sed obstant mss. cum ed. 1.

[3] Trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, we have removed the words *aforementioned question* [praemissa quaestione], which the Vatican edition here added.
[4] In the Vatican edition there is here added *one (difference)* [unam], and then at the end of the quote there is added *The other there (where he says): Moreover it must be noted*; but manuscripts together with edition 1 withstand this.

---

p. 270

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

De missione invisibili tum Filii tum Spiritus

ARTICLE SOLE

On the invisible mission both of the Son and

sancti.

QUAESTIO I.

Utrum missio invisibilis sit secundum dona gratie gratis datae, vel gratum facientis.

CIRCA PRIMUM, quod haec missio sit secundum dona gratiae gratis datae, ostenditur sic.

1. Rabanus[1] dicit de Spiritu sancto, quod ter datus est Spiritus sanctus. Et primo dicit, ipsum esse datum ad miraculorum operationem; constat autem, quod miraculorum operatio est gratia gratis data: ergo etc.

2. Item, Spiritus sanctus datur, cum datur donum prophetiae. Unde primo Regum decimo:[2] *Factus est spiritus Domini super Saul, et prophetabat*; sed donum prophetiae datur frequenter his qui non habent gratiam gratum facientem, sicut patet de Saul per textum: ergo etc.

3. Item, quod Filius mittatur secundum dona gratiae gratis datae, videtur. Tunc enim Filius dicitur mitti, quando fit revelatio occultorum, sed revelatio occultorum potest fieri sine dono gratiae gratum facientis. ergo etc..

4. Item, Augustinus dicit et habetur in praesenti distinctione,[3] quod « tunc Sapientia mittitur, cum a cuiusquam mente percipitur », sive cum alicui innotescit; si ergo percipitur et innotescit per dona gratiae gratis datae, ut per fidem informem: ergo videtur in illis dari: ergo etc.

CONTRA: 1. Augustinus[4] dicit, quod tunc datur Spiritus sanctus alicui, cum sic datur, ut eum faciat Dei et proximi dilectorem, hoc est dicere, quando datur homini caritas, sed caritas non est nisi gratiae gratum facientis: ergo etc.

2. Item, hoc ipsum videtur de Filio, quia dicitur Sapientiae septimo:[5] *In animas sanctas se transfert, et amicos Dei constituit*, sed amici Dei non dicuntur sine gratia gratum faciente: ergo etc.

of the Holy Spirit.

QUESTION I

Whether the invisible mission is according to gifts of the grace, freely given, and/or (of the grace) which makes one pleasing.

ABOUT THE FIRST, that this mission is according to gifts of the grace freely given, is shown in this manner:

1. (St.) Rabanus (Maurus)[1] says of the Holy Spirit, that the Holy Spirit was given three times. And first he says, that He was given for the working of miracles; but it is established, that the working of miracles is a grace freely given: ergo etc..

2. Likewise, the Holy Spirit is given, when the gift of prophecy is given. Whence in the First (Book) of Kings, tenth (chapter):[2] *The Spirit of the Lord came upon Saul, and he prophesized*; but the gift of prophecy is frequently given to those who do not have the grace which makes one pleasing, just as is clear concerning Saul through the text: ergo etc..

3. Likewise, it seems, that the Son is sent according to gifts of the grace freely given. For then the Son is said to be sent, when there comes to be a revelation of (things) hidden, but a revelation of (things) hidden can come to be without a gift of the grace which makes one pleasing: ergo etc..

4. Likewise, (St.) Augustine says and as is had in the present distinction,[3] that « then Wisdom is sent, when He is perceived by the mind of anyone », or when He becomes known to anyone; if, therefore, He is perceived and becomes known through gifts of the grace freely given, as through unformed faith: therefore it seems that He is given in these: ergo etc..

ON THE CONTRARY: 1. (St.) Augustine[4] says, that the Holy Spirit is then given to someone, when He is given thus, that He makes him (belong) to God and a lover of his neighbor, that is to say, when charity is given to a man, but charity belongs not but to the grace which makes one pleasing: ergo etc..

2. Likewise, this very (thing) seems concerning the Son, because there is said in the seventh (chapter) of Wisdom:[5] *Into holy souls does He transfer Himself, and has established them friends of God*; but they

are not said (to be) "friends of God" without the grace which makes one pleasing: ergo etc..

3. Item, *ratione* ostenditur sic:[6] tunc datur vel mittitur Spiritus sanctus, quando habitat in homine; sed non dicitur habitare in homine sine gratia gratum faciente: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, it is shown *by reason* in this manner:[6] the Holy Spirit is then given and/or sent, when He dwells in a man; but He is not said to dwell in a man without the grace which makes one pleasing: ergo etc..

4. Item, cum mittitur Filuis vel Spiritus sanctus ad aliquem, non mittitur, ut sit[7] ubi prius non erat, sed ut sit in eo aliter quam prius; sed novus modus essendi, addens supra esse per naturam, non est nisi per gratiam gratum facientem: ergo etc.

4. Likewise, when the Son and/or Holy Spirit is sent to someone, He is not sent, to be[7] where He was not before, but to be in him in a manner other than before; but a new manner of being, adding upon 'being' through nature, is not but through the grace which makes one pleasing: ergo etc..

CONCLUSIO.

In missione visibili utraque persona non datur simpliciter, nisi dono gratiae gratum facientis, secundum quid vero datur etiam per gratiam gratis datam.

CONCLUSION

In an invisible mission each Person is not given simply, except by a gift of grace which makes one pleasing, according to which, however, He is also given through a grace given freely.

Respondeo: Ad hoc distinguunt aliqui, quod Spiritum sanctum dari vel mitti invisibiliter, hoc[8] potest esse vel in quantum *Spiritus*, vel in quantum *sanctus*. In quantum *Spiritus*, datur per donum gratiae gratis datae; in quantum *sanctus* vel[9] sanctificans, datur per dona gratiae gratum facientis. Similiter Sapientia vel Filius potest mitti vel prout *faciens sapere*, et sic per dona gratiae gratis datae; vel prout *sapientia* dicta est a *sapore*, et sic per dona gratiae gratum facientis. Sed istud non videtur solvere, quia dantem oppositum istius solutionis est possible adhuc solvere[10] et quaerere de Spiritu et Verbo, quodmodo dicatur dari et non inhabitare.

I respond: Some distinguish regarding this, "the Holy Spirit is given and/or sent invisibly", that this[8] can be either inasmuch as (He is) *the Spirit*, and/or inasmuch as (He is) *Holy*. Inasmuch as (He is) *the Spirit*, He is given through a gift of the grace freely given; inasmuch as (He is) *Holy* and/or[9] the Sanctifier, He is given through the gifts of grace which make one pleasing. Similarly Wisdom and/or the Son can be sent either insofar as (He is) *the One making one know*, and thus through gifts of the grace freely given, and/or insofar as "*wisdom*" [sapientia] has been said from "*taste*" [sapore], and thus through the gifts of the grace which makes one pleasing. But that does not seem to solve (the question), because it is still possible that the one granting the opposite of this solution solve (it)[10] and ask concerning the Spirit and the Word, in what manner is He said to be given and not indwell.

Propter hoc aliter dicendum tam de Filio quam de Spiritu sancto, quod[11] *dari* vel *mitti* est dupliciter: vel *simpliciter*, vel *ad hoc*. Tunc datur *simpliciter*, quando simpliciter habetur, videlicet non tantum ad usum, sed ad fructum; hoc autem est solum per dona gratiae gratum facientis; et ideo solum in illa datur simpliciter vel Filius vel Spiritus sanctus. Alio modo dicitur dari *ad hoc*,

On this account it must be said in another manner both concerning the Son as concerning the Holy Spirit, that[11] "*to be given*" and/or "*to be sent*" is (said) in a twofold manner: either *simply*, and/or *for this*. He is then given *simply*, when He is had simply, namely not only for using, but for enjoying; but this is only through gifts of the grace which make one pleasing; and for

quando non ad fructum, sed ad auxilium sive ad aliquem usum aliqua dona donantur; et hoc quidem,[12] cum dantur aliqua dona gratiae gratis datae, in qubus ma- / nifestatur . . .

that reason only among those is either the Son and/or the Holy Spirit given simply. In another manner He is said "to be given *for* /-*this*", when some gifts are given not for enjoyment, but to help or for some use; and this indeed,[12] when some gifts of the grace freely given are given, in which there / is manifested . . .

---

[1] Vide surpa d. 14. dub. 4.
[2] Vers. 10, ubi Vulgata habet: Et insiluit super eum spiritus Domini et prophetavit in medio eorum.
[3] Cap. 7. — Paulo infra post *ergo percipitur* unus alterque codex ut I T *sive* loco *et*.
[4] Libr. XI. de Trin. c. 17. n. 31: Spiritus sanctus . . . cum datus fuerit homini, accendit eum in dilectionem Dei et proximi, et ipse dilectio est. — Vat., obnitentibus mss. et sex primis edd., *per Augustinum dicitur*, et mox, refragantibus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1, *hominibus* pro *homini*.
[5] Vers. 27, ubi Vulgata post *transfert*, omissa particula *et*, prosequitur: amicos Dei et Prophetas constituit.
[6] Supplevimus ex vetustioribus codd. et ed. 1 *sic*.
[7] Fide mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 removimus in Vat. additum *ibi*. Mox ed. 1 *sed ut insit* loco *sed ut sit*.
[8] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *hoc*. Mox post *esse* cod. A addit *dupliciter*.
[9] Fide multorum codd. ut F G H I M P Q X Z aa ee ff et ed. 1 adiunximus *sanctus vel*; aliqui codd. ut F P Q loco *vel* habent *id est*. Paulo ante plures codd. ut H M P Q T X aa ee cum ed. 1 post *datae* addunt *sed*.
[10] Aristot., II. Elench. c. 3. (c. 22), cuius verba vide supra d. 4. dub. 3.
[11] Cod. A satis bene *scilicet quod*.
[12] Ita plurimi anitquiorum mss. cum ed. 1, sed Vat. cum cod. cc loco *quidem* habet *fit*; cod. X *quando* pro *quidem cum*.

[1] See above d. 14, dubium 4.
[2] Verse 10, where the Vulgate has: The Spirit of the Lord leapt upon him and he prophesied in their midst.
[3] Chapter 7. — A little below this after *if therefore He is perceived* [si ergo percipitur] one or another codex, such as I and T, have *or* [sive] in place of the *and* [et].
[4] On the Trinity, Bk. XI, ch. 17, n. 31: the Holy Spirit . . . when he has been given to a man, enkindles him in the love of God and of neighbor, and is this love. — The Vatican edition, with the manuscripts and the six first editions striving against it, has *through (St.) Augustine there is said* [per Augustinum dicitur], and then, breaking with the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, reads *to men* [hominibus] for *to a man* [homini].
[5] Verse 27, where the Vulgate after *does He transfer Himself* [se tranfert] omits the *and* [et] and proceeds thus: *friends of God and Prophets does He establish.*
[6] We have supplied from the older codices and from edition 1: *in this manner* [sic].
[7] Trusting in the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, and 3, we have removed the *there* [ibi] added in the Vatican edition. Then edition 1 has *but to be in* [sed ut insit] for *but to be* [sed ut sit].
[8] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have inserted *this* [hoc]. then after *be* [esse] codex A adds *in a twofold manner,* [dupliciter].
[9] Trusting in many codices, such as F G H I M P Q X Z aa ee and ff, and in edition 1, we have inserted *Holy and/or* [sanctus vel]; some codices, such as F P and Q have *that is* [id est] in place of *and/or* [vel]. A little before this very many codices, such as H M P Q T X aa and ee, together with edition 1, have added *but* [sed] after *the grace freely given* [gratiae gratis datae].
[10] Aristotle, Lists of Sophistic Errors, Bk. II, ch. 3 (ch. 22), the words of which are above in d. 4, dubium 3.
[11] Codex A reads sufficiently well *namely that* [scilicet quod].
[12] Thus very many of the more ancient manuscripts together with edition 1, but the Vatican edition together with codex cc has *come to be* [fit] in place of *indeed* [quidem]; codex X has *when* [quando] for *indeed when* [quidem cum].

---

p. 271

ma- / -nifestatur Filius vel Spiritus sanctus; et sic procedunt rationes ad primam partem.

is manifested the Son and/or the Holy Spirit, and in this manner proceed the reasons for the first part.

1. Nam[1] sic intelligendum est verbum Rabani; et ipse enim *communiter* loquitur de missione; unde dicit, Spiritum sanctum ter datum. Augustinus autem solum loquitur de datione vel missione, quae est ad habitandum vel simipliciter habendum.

1. For[1] thus must be understood the word of (St.) Rabanus (Maurus); for he also speaks *commonly* of mission; whence he says, that the Holy Spirit (has been) given three times. But (St.) Augustine only speaks of the granting and/or mission, which is to dwell and/or to be had simply.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur de prophetia, dicendum, quod *uno* modo datur in ea Spiritus sanctus simpliciter, prout ipsa dicit cognitionem secundum ideoneitatem suscipientis et secundum pietatem[2] exsequentis. *Alio* modo, prout est revelatio,[3] non datur in ea Spiritus *simpliciter* sive non mittitur nisi *ad hoc*. Unde non dicitur in libro Regum, quod Spiritus sanctus sit missus *ad* Saul, vel factus *in* Saul, sed *super* Saul.

2. To that which is objected concerning prophecy, it must be said, that in *one* manner the Holy Spirit is given simply in it, insofar as it means a cognition according to the idoneity of the one taking-it-up and according to the piety[2] of the one executing it. In *another* manner, insofar as it is a revelation,[3] the Spirit is not given in it *simply* or is not sent except *for this*. Whence there is not said in the Book of Kings, that the Holy Spirit was sent "*to*" Saul, and/or wrought "*in*" Saul, but "*over Saul*".

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod mittitur Filius, cum est[4] revelatio occultorum; dicendum, quod hoc non est in quacumque revelatione; nam aliqua fit revelatio, non per missionem Filii, sed per missionem Angeli; — multa enim revelantur ab Angelis;[5]— sed intelligitur de illa revelatione, in qua est animae illustratio per gratiam; et si per gratis datam, non simpliciter mittitur, sed si per gratum facientem, tunc simpliciter mittitur et habetur.

3. To that which is objected, that the Son is sent, when there is[4] a revelation of (things) hidden; it must be said, that this is not in any revelation whatsoever; for in some a revelation comes to be, not through the mission of the Son, but through the mission of an Angel; — for many (things) are revealed by the Angels;[5] but it is understood of that revelation, in which there is an brightening [illustratio] of the soul through a grace; and if through one given freely, He is not sent simply, but if through one making one pleasing, then He is sent and had simply.

4. Ad illud quod ultimo obiicitur, quod tunc mittitur, quando percipitur; dicendum, quod non sufficit cognoscere Filium, quod sit ab alio, immo oportet, quod cognoscat, quod sit in ipso ut in suo habitaculo. Hoc autem dico non cognitione necessitatis, sed coniecturae,[6] nec de cognitione actuali, sed de habituali.

4. To that which is objected last, that He is then sent, when He is perceived; it must be said, that it is not sufficient to cognize the Son, that He be from Another, nay it is necessary [oportet], that one cognizes, that He is in him as in His own, little dwelling. But this I say (is) not by a cognition of necessity, but (by one) of conjecture,[6] nor from an actual cognition, but from a habitual one.

SCHOLION.

I. Antiquiores Scholastici gratiam *gratis datum* accipiebant in sensu largiore, quam moderni theologi, ita ut omnem gratiam *actualem*, quatenus distinguitur a gratia *sanctificante*, sub hoc nomine complecterentur (cf. II. Sent. d. 28. a. 2. q. 1 in *corp*. et alibi passim). — Distinctio in corp. posita inter *dari simpliciter* et *ad hoc* eadem est ac *simpliciter* et *secundum quid*.

SCHOLIUM

I. The more ancient Scholastics used to accept "grace *freely given*" in a sense broader, than modern theologians, thus that every *actual* grace, to the extend that it is distinguished from *sanctifying* grace, would be comprised under this name (cf. Sent, Bk. II, d. 28, a. 2, q. 1, in the *body* of the response, and elsewhere in passing). — The distinction posited in the body (of the

response) between *to be given simply* and *(to be given) for this* is the same as *simply* and secundum quid.

II. Primam solutionem, quae etiam attribuitur B. Albeto (I. Sent. d. 17. a. 9.), S. Doctor non approbat. B. Albert. sic dicit: «Dicendum, quod, ut puto, non dicetur mitti, nisi in caritate simpliciter, sed secundum quid in aliis, ut mittatur videlicet in aliis ut *Spiritus* est, et non ut *sanctus* est ». Sed haec sententia Alberti in re non videtur esse alia a communi. S. Bonav. suam opinionem iuxta distinctionem ibi factam duplici conclusione proponit, scil. quod proprie et simpliciter Spiritus sanctus non mittitur nec datur nisi per donum gratiae sanctificantis. Ratio est, quia sine hoc dono et caritate non habemus facultatem fruendi Spiritu sancto. Quod explicat S. Thom. (S. I. q. 43. a. 3.) his verbis: « Super modum communem (quo Deus est in rebus) est unus specialis, qui convenit naturae rationali, in qua Deus dicitur esse sicut cognitum in cognoscente et amatum in amante. Et quia cognoscendo et amando creatura rationalis sua operatione attingit ad ipsum Deum, secundum istum specialem modum Deus non solum dicitur esse in creatura rationali, sed etiam habitare in ea sicut in templo suo ». *Improprie* tamen, sive « extenso nomine missionis » (ut loquitur Alex. Hal.), aliquando dicitur mitti Spiritus sanctus ad aliquem actum gratiae actualis vel gratis datae. In hoc doctrina consentiunt Alex. Hal., S. Thom., Scot., Richard. alique inummeri.

II. The first solution, which is also attributed to Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), Sent., Bk. I, d. 17, a. 9, the Seraphic Doctor does not approve. Bl. (now St.) Albert says thus: « It must be said, that, as I think, He would not be said to be sent, not in charity simply, but secundum quid in others, as namely He is sent in others as being *the Spirit*, and not as *being Holy* ». But this sentence of (St.) Albert does not seem to be other than the common one in the matter. St. Bonaventure proposes his own opinion according to the distinction made there in the twofold conclusion, namely that properly and simply the Holy Spirit is not sent nor given except through the gift of sanctifying grace. The reason is, that without this gift and charity we do not have the faculty of enjoying the Holy Spirit. Wherefore St. Thomas (Summa., I, q. 43, a. 3) explains in these words: « Above the common manner (whereby God is in things) there is a special one, which befits a rational nature, in which God is said to be as One cognized in the one cognizing and One loved in the one loving. And because by cognizing and by loving a rational creature by its own operation attains to God Himself, according to this special manner God is not only said to be in a rational creature, but also to dwell in it as in His own temple ». However, *improperly*, or « having extended the name "mission" », as Alexander of Hales says, the Holy Spirit is sometimes said to be sent for some act of actual grace and/or of (the grace) freely given. In this doctrine Alexander of Hales, St. Thomas, (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, Richard (of Middleton) and innumerable others, agree.

III. Cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 73. m. 4. a. 2. — S. Thom., hic q. 4. a. 1; S. I. q. 43. a. 3. — B. Albert., de hac et seq. hic a. 16. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 3. a. 2. — Richard. a Med., I. Sent. d. 14. a. 2. q. 2. — Aegid. R., d. 14. secunda princ. q. 2. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 3. — Biel, de hac et seq. I. Sent. d. 14. q. 1. 2.

III. Cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 73, m. 4, a. 2. — St. Thomas, here in q. 4,. a. 1; Summa., I, q. 43, a. 3. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Ma gnus), on this and the following question, here in a. 16. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 3, a. 2. — Richard of Middleton, Sent., Bk. I, d. 14, a. 2, q. 2. — Giles the Roman, d. 14, 2nd. princ., q. 2. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 3. — (Gabriel) Biel, on this and the following question, here in Sent., Bk. I, d. 14, qq. 1 and 2.

[1] In Vat. desideratur *Nam*, quod tamen in mss. et tribus primis edd. habetur. Paulo infra maiorem partem codd. ut C G H I R S T U V W aa bb cc ee ff cum ed. 1 secuti, substituimus *Spiritum sanctum ter datum* pro *Spiritus sanctus ter datur*. Mox post *autem* ope plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *solum*, pro quo aliqui codd. ut A V X *solummodo*. Dein plures codd. ut A G I K T etc. *inhabitandum* pro *habitandum*.
[2] In cod. K adiicitur *exponentis vel*.
[3] Fide mss. et ed. 1 delevimus hic in Vat. non bene additum *et sic*. — Cfr. August., II. de Divers. QQ. ad Simpl. q. 1.
[4] Mss. cum ed. 1 *est* loco *fit*. Paulo infra cod. X *aliquando* pro *aliqua*.
[5] Quia lectio antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 *multa enim revelant* est incompleta, probabiliter siquidem excidit verbum *Angeli*, reliquimus lectionem Vat.; cod. cc et ed. 2 *revelantur Angelis*, sed perperam. Paulo infra pauci codd. ut A I S cc cum ed. 1 male *et sic* loco *et si*.
[6] Cod. X *convenientiae*, cod. Z *congruentiae*.

[1] In the Vatican edition *For* [Nam] is wanting, which however is had in the manuscripts and in three first editions. A little below this having followed a greater part of the codices, such as C G H I R S T U V W aa bb cc and ee, together with edition 1, we have substituted *that the Holy Spirit (has been given) three times* [Spiritum sanctum ter datum] for *the Holy Spirit is given three times* [Spiritus sanctus ter datur]. Then after *But (St.) Augustine* [Augustinus autem], we have supplied *only* [solum], in place of which some codices, such as A V and X, have *only* [solummodo]. Then very many codices, such as A G I K T etc., have *indwell* [inhabitandum] for *dwell* [habitandum].
[2] In codex K there is added *of the one expounding and/or* [exponentis vel].
[3] Trusting the manuscripts and edition 1, we have deleted the *and in this manner* [et sic] not so well added in the Vatican edition. — Cfr. (St.) Augustine, On Diverse Questions: to Simplicius, Bk. II, q. 1.
[4] The manuscripts together with edition 1 read *there is* [est] in place of *there comes to be* [fit]. A little below this codex X has *sometimes* [aliquando] for *in some* [aliqua].
[5] Because the reading of the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 *for reveal many (things)* [multa enim revelant] is incomplete, if indeed the word *the Angels* [Angeli] has probably fallen away, we have left the reading of the Vatican edition; codex cc and edition 1 have *many (things) are revealed to the Angels* [multa revelantur Angelis], but faultily. A little below this a few codices, such as A I S and cc, together with edition 1, read badly *and thus* [et sic] in place of *and if* [et si].
[6] Codex X has *(by one) of fittingness* [convenientiae], codex Z has *(by one) of congruence* [congruentiae]. [Trans note: here the Seraphic Doctor excludes the transient cognition or vision as a certain confirmation of the presence of the Eternal Word in the believer, a doctrine that reappears in St. John of the Cross, Ascent of Mt. Carmel.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros

Commentaries on the Four Books of

Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XV.

PARS II.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio II.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 271-272.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

QUAESTIO II.

Utrum Filius et Spiritus sanctus secundum eadem dona gratiae mitti dicantur.

Secundo quaeritur, utrum secundum eadem dona gratiae dicantur mitti Filius et Spiritus sanctus. Et quod non, videtur hoc modo.

1. Missio Spiritus sancti est eius donatio, et similiter Filii;[7] sed alia est missio Filii et Spiritus sancti: ergo alia donatio: ergo secundum aliud donum.

2. Item, hoc ipsum videtur *per simile*, quia sicut se habet missio visibilis Filii ad missionem visibilem Spiritus sancti, ita etiam et invisibilis; sed missio visibilis Filii et Spiritus sancti est secundum alium et alium effectum et signum in creatura: ergo invisibilis secundum aliud et aliud donum.

3. Item, missio est ad cognoscendam emanationem et discernedam;[8] si ergo Filius discernitur ab effectu, in quo mittitur, et Spiritus sanctus; et huius- / -modi sunt dona gratiae: . . .

[7] Cfr. supra q. 1.

[8] Vide supra p. I. q. 1. 3. 4. huis dist. — Mox cod. H *per effectum*, cod. T *in effectu* pro *effectu*. Circa finem argumenti post *Filius* in cod. bb additur *et*.

Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XV

PART II

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 271-272.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUESTION 2

Whether the Son and the Holy Spirit are said to be sent according to the same gifts of grace.

Second there is asked, whether according to the same gifts the Son and the Holy Spirit are said to be sent. And that (They are) not, seems in this manner:

1. The being-sent [missio] of the Holy Spirit is His donation, and similarly the Son's;[7] but there is another mission of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: therefore another donation: therefore another gift.

2. Likewise, this very (thing) seems per simile, because just as the visible mission of the Son holds itself to the visible mission of the Holy Spirit, so also even the invisible: but the visible mission of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is according to one and another effect and sign in the creature: therefore the invisible (is) according to one and another gift.

3. Likewise, a mission is for an emanation being cognized and discerned;[8] if, therefore, the Son is discerned by the effect, in which He is sent, (then) the Holy Spirit also; and of this / kind are the gifts of grace: . . .

[7] Cf. above q. 1.

[8] See above p. I, qq. 1, 3 and 4 of this distinction. — Then codex H has *through the effect* [per effectum], codex T *in the effect* [in effectu] for *by the effect* [effectu]. Near the end of the argument, after *the Son is sent* [mittitur Filius] in codex bb there is

added *and* [et].

p. 272

huius- / -modi sunt dona gratiae: ergo quantum ad aliud donum mittitur Filius, quantum ad aliud Spiritus sanctus.

of this / kind are the gifts of grace: therefore as much as regards one gift the Son is sent, as much as regards the other the Holy Spirit.

4. Item, non est idem appropriatum Filio et Spiritui sancto, sed aliud in creaturis:[1] ergo cum Filius dicatur mitti in effectu sibi appropriato, in alio effectu vel dono mittitur Filius quam Spiritus sanctus.

4. Likewise, the same (thing) is not appropriated to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, but (there is something) different among creatures:[1] therefore since the Son is said to be sent in an effect appropriated to Himself, the Son is sent in an effect and/or gift other than the Holy Spirit (is).

Contra: 1. Omnis donorum distribuitio tam gratiae gratis datae quam gratiae gratum facientis attribuitur Spiritui sancto, maxime dona gratiae gratum facientis, sicut patet primae ad Corinthios duodecimo:[2] ergo cum Spiritus sanctus mittatur in donis sibi appropriatis, in omnibus donis mittitur: ergo in eisdem, in quibus Filius.

On the contrary: 1. Every distribution of gifts, both of the grace given freely as well as of the grace which makes one pleasing, is attributed to the Holy Spirit, most of all the gifts of the grace which makes one pleasing, just as is clear in the twelfth (chapter) of the First (Letter of St. Paul) to the Corinthians:[2] therefore since the Holy Spirit is sent in the gifts appropriated to Him, He is sent in all the gifts: therefore in the same, in which the Son (is sent).

2. Item, Filius mittitur, cum sapientiae datur, et similiter Spiritus sanctus, quia praecipuum donum Spiritus sancti est sapientia: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, the Son is sent, when wisdom is given, and similarly the Holy Spirit, because the chief [praecipuum] gift of the Holy Spirit is wisdom: ergo etc..

3. Item, quandocumque datur cognitio, dicitur mitti Filius: sed in hoc eodem dono datur vel mittitur Spiritus sanctus, Ioannis decimo sexto:[3] *Cum venerit ille, docebit vos omnem veritatem*: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, whensoever cognition is given, the Son is said to be sent: but in this same gift there is given and/or sent the Holy Spirit, according to the sixteenth (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John:[3] *When He shall have come, He shall teach you all truth*: ergo etc..

4. Item, quandocumque caritas datur, mittitur Spiritus sanctus, sed in hoc dono datur Filius, Sapientiae septimo:[4] *In animas sanctas se transfert et amicos Dei constituit*; et Augustinus in quarto de Trinitate[5] exponit illud de missione Filii: ergo etc.

4. Likewise, whensoever charity is given, the Holy Spirit is sent, but in this gift the Son is given, according to the seventh (chapter of the Book) of Wisdom:[4] *Into holy souls does He transfer Himself and establish them friends of God*; and (St.) Augustine in the fourth (book) On the Trinity[5] expound that (verse) concerning the mission of the Son: ergo etc..

CONCLUSIO.

Missiones Filii et Spiritus sancti in se et quoad radicem donorum sunt indivisae; distinguuntur tantum quoad habitus et actus consequentes.

CONCLUSION

The Missions of the Son and of the Holy Spirit in themselves and in regard to the root of their gifts are undivided; they are distinguished only in regard to habits and consequent acts.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod in missione invisibili est donorum collatio, in quibus est *manifestatio* et *inhabitatio*. Et secundum hoc intelligendum est, quod est loqui de donis Dei quantum ad *radicem*, vel quantum ad *habitum*, vel quantum ad *actum consequentem*.

I respond: It must be said, that in the invisible mission there is a conferral of gifts, among which there is *manifestation* and *indwelling*. And according to this it must be understood, that concerning the gifts of God one may speak [loqui est] as much as regards (their) *root*, and/or as much as regards *habit* and/or as much as regards (their) *consequent act*.

Loquendo autem quantum ad *radicem*, sic quia una est gratia gratum faciens, per quam inhabitat Filius et Spiritus sanctus, quae est radix donorum gratuitorum, sic dantur vel mittuntur eodem dono.

Moreover, speaking as much as regards (their) *root*, thus because there is one grace which makes one pleasing, through which the Son indwells and the Holy Spirit (too), which is the root of gratuitous gifts, so They are given and/or sent in (this) same gift.

Loquendo autem quantum ad *habitem*, sic distinguendum, quia[6] quidam habitus sunt *pure affectivi*, quidam *pure cognititvi*, quidam *medii*. In habitibus *pure affectivis* datur sive mittitur Spiritus sanctus, quia ei approprianture. In habitibus *pure cognitivis* nec Filius nec Spiritus sanctus proprie, sicut dictum est,[7] mittitur. In habitibus autem *partim* cognitivis *partim* affectivis, secundum quod diversa in se continent, et Filius mittitur et Spiritus sanctus. Nam cognitivi ducunt in manifestationem Verbi, affectivi in manifestationem Amoris.

Moreover, speaking as much as regards *habit*, thus one must distinguish, that[6] certain habits are *purely affective*, certain ones *purely cognitive*, certain ones *in the middle* [medii]. In habits *purely affective* the Holy Spirit is given or sent, because they are appropriated to Him. In habits *purely cognitive* neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit are properly sent, as has been said.[7] But in habits *partly* cognitive *partly* affective, according to which they contain diverse (objects) in themselves, both the Son and the Holy Spirit is sent. For cognitive (habits) lead unto the manifestation of the Word, affective ones unto the manifestation of Love.

Si autem loquamur quantum ad *actus consequentes*, qui sunt illuminatio intellectus et affectus inflammatio, sic vocando donum, in aliis et aliis donis mittuntur.

Moreover, if we speak as much as regards (their) *consequent acts*, which are the illumination of the intellect and the inflaming of the affection, in saying “gift” in this manner, They are sent in one and another gifts.

Sed quoniam ista[8] coniuncta sunt, ideo missio Filii et Spiritus sancti invisibilis sunt indivisae, et secundum hoc procedunt rationes ad oppositas partes. Tamen illud quod adducit *pro simili* in missione sensibili, nequaquam est simile, quia non est tanta unio et connexio in signis exterioribus, quanta est in habitibus interioribus.

But since these[8] are conjoined, for that reason the invisible mission of the Son and (that) of the Holy Spirit are undivided, and according to this proceed the reasons for the opposing sides. However, that one which adduces pro simili in the sensible mission, is by no means similar, because there is no union and connection among exterior signs so great, as is (that) among interior habits.

SCHOLION.

I. Quoad missionem *simpliciter* dictam, quae est secundum gratiam sanctificantem, omnes concorditer asserunt, missiones utriusque personae esse indivisas, sed quoad missionem improprie dictam sive

SCHOLIUM

I. In regard to “mission” *simply* said, which is according to sanctifying grace, all harmoniously assert, that the missions of each Person are undivided, but in regard to “mission” improperly said or secundum quid

secundum quid aliqui cum Alex. Hal. (S. p. I. q. 73. m. 2. a. 3) dicunt, utramque personam aliquando simul mitti vel dari, non tamen semper. Hoc explicat Alex. Hal. (loc. cit.) sic: « Cum missio passive dicta sit processio manifestata in effectu appropriato personae vel manifestatio processionis; cum processio Filii non sit processio Spiritus sancti, nec idem effectus, in quo manifestatur utraque processio, ratione cuius dicitur mitti Filius vel Spiritus sanctus, immo unus effectus possit esse sine alio, et manifestatio unius processionis sine manifestatio alterius: ideo potest esse una missio sine alia. Non sic autem est de missione active dicta » etc. Cui sententiae etiam Richard. a Med. adhaeret. Petr. a Tar. vero, Aegid. R. aliique plures hoc non admittunt, nec SS. Bonav. et Thom. sic loquuntur. Dicunt enim, quod quoad actum consequentem, sive effectus gratiae, qui sunt illuminatio intellectus et inflammatio affectus, hae duae missiones differunt, quin tamen una possit esse sine alia.

II. Alex. Hal., l. c. et m. 4. a. 2. — S. Thom., hic q. 4. a. 2; S. I. q.43. a. 5. praesertim ad 3., ubi fere iisdem verbis ac S. Bonav. utitur. — B. Albert., d. 17. a. 2. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 2. a. 2; q. 3. a. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 4. q. 1. 2. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 2. — Durand., hic q. 4. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 3.

some together with Alexander of Hales, (Summa., p. I, q. 73, m. 2, a. 3), say, that each Person sometimes is sent and/or given at the same time, however not always. Alexander of Hales explains this (loc. cit.) in this manner: « Since “mission” passively said is the procession manifested in an effect appropriated to the Person and/or a manifestation of the procession; (and) since the procession of the Son is not the procession of the Holy Spirit, neither (is) the effect the same, in which each procession is manifested, by reason of which the Son and/or the Holy Spirit is said to be sent, nay one effect can be without the other, and the manifestation of one procession without the manifestation of the other: for that reason there can be one mission without the other. But not so is it concerning “mission” actively said » etc.. To which sentence Richard of Middleton adheres. But (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, Giles the Roman, and very many others do not admit this, nor do Sts. Bonaventure and Thomas speak in this manner. For they say, that in regard to the consequent act, these two missions do differ, but yet the one cannot be without the other.

II. Alexander of Hales, loc. cit. and m. 4, a. 2. — St. Thomas, here in q. 4, a. 2; Summa., I, q.43, a. 5, especially reply to n. 3., where he uses nearly the same words as St. Bonaventure. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), d. 17, a. 2. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 2, a. 2; q. 3, a. 2. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 4, qq. 1 and 2. — Giles the Roman, here in 1st. princ., q. 2. — Durandus, here in q. 4. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 3.

---

[1] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *creaturis* pro *creatura*.
[2] Vers. 4. seqq.
[3] Vers. 13, ubi Vulgata: cum autem venerit ille Spiritus veritatis, docebit etc. — Paulo ante Vat. cum cod. cc, antiquioribus tamen mss. et ed. 1 reluctantibus, omittit *eodem*.
[4] Vers. 27. Lectionem Vulgatae vide q. praec. fundam. 2.
[5] Cap. 20. n. 27: In animas enim sanctas se transfert (Sapientia) atque amicos Dei et Prophetas constituit, sicut etiam implet sanctos Angelos et omnia talibus ministeriis congrua per eos operatur. Cum autem venit plenitudo temporis, missa est, non ut impleret Angelos nec ut esset Angelus, nisi in quantum consilium Patris annuntiabat, quod et ipsius erat; nec ut esset cum hominibus aut in hominibus;

[1] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *among creatures* [in creaturis] for *in a creature* [in creatura].
[2] Verse 4 ff.
[3] Verse 13, where the Vulgate reads: But when He will have come, the Spirit of Truth, He shall teach etc. [cum autem venerit ille Spiritus veritatis, docebit]. — A little before this the Vatican edition together with cc, yet with the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 struggling against this, omit *same* [eodem].
[4] Verse 27. For the reading of the Vulgate, see the preceding question, fundament n. 2.
[5] Chapter 20, n. 27: For into holy souls does (Wisdom) transfer Himself and He has established them as friends of God and Prophets, just as He also fills the Holy Angels and works all (things) congruous

hoc etiam et antea in Patribus et Prophetis; sed ut ipsum Verbum caro fieret, id est, homo fieret etc.

[6] Ed. 1 *quod* loco *quia*.

[7] Hic q. praecedenti, praesertim ad 2. et 3.

[8] Scil. radix, habitus et actus consequentes donorum. — Paulo infra fide plurimum mss. ut C F S Y substituimus *invisibilis* pro *invisibiles*.

through them by such ministers. But when the fullness of time came, He was sent, not to fill the Angels nor to be an Angel, except inasmuch as He was announcing the counsel of the Father, which was also His; nor to be with men or in men; this (He was) even beforehand both in the Patriarchs and Prophets; but so that the Word Himself might become flesh, that is, might become Man etc..

[6] Edition 1 has *that* [quod] in place of *than* [quia].

[7] Here in the preceding question, especially in reply to nn. 2 and 3.

[8] That is, the root, habit and consequent acts of the gifts. — A little below this, trusting in the very many manuscripts, such as C F S Y, we have substituted the singular for the plural of *invisible*.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XV.

PARS II.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio III.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 273-274.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XV

PART II

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 3

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 273-274.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO III.

Utrum Filius et Spiritus sanctus mittantur, quando dona gratiae augmentantur.

TERTIO QUAERITUR, utrum missio Filii et

QUESTION 3

Whether the Son and the Holy Spirit are sent, when gifts of grace are augmented.

THIRD THERE IS ASKED, whether the mission

Spiritus sancti sit secundum eadem dona gratiae augmentata. Et quod sic, videtur *exemplo*, *auctoritate* et *ratione*.

of the Son and the Holy Spirit is according to the same augmented gifts of grace. And that it is, seems *from example*, *authority* and *reason*.

1. Exemplo sic: constat, in die Pentecostes Apostolis esse Spiritum sanctum missum, non tantum visibiliter, sed etiam invisibiliter, quia missio visibilis sine invisibili non confert; sed ipsi prius habebant gratiam: ergo etc.

1. By an example in this manner: it is established, that on the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit was sent to the Apostles, not only visibly, but also invisible, because the visible mission without the invisible does not confer, but they had grace before (this): ergo etc..

2. Item, hoc videtur auctoritate Rabani:[1] « In baptismo datur Spiritus sanctus ad habitationem Deo consecrandam, sed in confirmatione cum omni plenitudine sanctitatis venit in hominem »: ergo datur in confirmatione post baptismum: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, it seems according to the authority of (St.) Rabanus (Maurus):[1] « In Baptism the Holy Spirit is given to consecrate a dwelling for God, but in Confirmation He comes into a man with all the fullness of holiness »: therefore He is given in Confirmation after Baptism: ergo etc..

3. Item, augmentum gratiae est per gratiae additionem; sed ubi est gratiae additio, ibi est[2] gratiae donatio; sed « Spiritus sanctus mittitur vel datur, cum datur eius gratia », ut dicit Beda:[3] ergo in augmento gratiae datur vel mittitur Spiritus sanctus.

3. Likewise, the augment of grace is through the addition of grace; but where there is an addition of grace, there is[2] a donation of grace; but « the Holy Spirit is sent and/or given, when His grace is given », as (St.) Bede (the Venerable) says.[4] therefore in the augment of grace the Holy Spirit is given and/or sent.

4. Item, non minus donum est caritatem consummare quam inchoare: ergo si mittitur Filius vel Spiritus sanctus, cum gratia inchoatur, multo fortius cum consummatur; sed consummatur per augmentum: ergo mittitur in augmento.

4. Likewise, it is not less a gift to add charity together [consummare] than to take it in hand [inchoare]: therefore if the Son and/or the Holy Spirit is sent, when grace is taken in hand, much more strongly when it is added together; but it is added together through an augment: therefore (Each) is sent in an augment.

Contra: 1. Spiritus sanctus non mittitur in hominem, ut de novo sit in eo, sed ut aliter sit in ipso; sed in eo, in quo augetur gratia, non est aliter quam prius; ergo ad illum[5] non mittitur.

On the contrary: 1. The Holy Spirit is not sent into a man, to be anew in him, but (rather) to be in another manner in him; but in him, in whom grace is enlarged [augetur], He is not in a manner other than before: therefore He is not sent to him.[5]

2. Item, si mittitur in augmento gratiae, aut ergo quia de novo mittitur, aut quia abundantius mittitur; *non* quia de novo: ergo quia abundantius. *Sed contra*: mitti est procedere, ergo abundantius mitti est abundantius procedere; sed semper aequaliter procedit: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, if He is sent in an augment of grace, either, therefore, because He is sent anew, or because He is sent more abundantly; *not* because (He is sent) anew: therefore because more abundantly. *But on the contrary*: to be sent is to proceed, therefore to be sent more abundantly is to more abundantly proceed; but (Each) proceeds always, equally: ergo etc..

3. Item, si mittitur in gratiae augmento, cum ergo gratia in nobis quotidie augeatur, etiam homine nesciente, videtur quod

3. Likewise, if (Each) is sent in the augment of grace, since, therefore, grace is enlarged in us daily, even without a man knowing it,

Spiritus sanctus vel Filius mittatur, homine nesciente, et[6] quod quotidie mittatur homini; quod non est dicendum.

it seems that the Holy Spirit and/or the Son is sent, without a man knowing it, and[6] that daily (Each) is sent to a man; which is not to be said.

4. Item, contingit gratiam caritatis in aliquo per negligentiam remitti: ergo si Spiritus sanctus mittitur in augmento, et recedit in remissione: ergo quando aliquis peccat venialiter, perdit Spiritus sanctum; quod falsum est.

4. Likewise, it happens that the grace of charity is let go [remitti] in some through negligence: therefore if the Holy Spirit is sent in an augment, and withdraws in its being let go [in remissione]: therefore when someone sins venially, He loses [perdit] the Holy Spirit; which is false.

CONCLUSIO.

Spiritus sanctus non dicitur mitti, quando solummodo fit profectus in gratia prius habita, sed in collatione novi usus vel novi doni gratuiti dicitur mitti.

CONCLUSION

The Holy Spirit is not said "to be sent", only when an advance comes to be in a grace already had, but He is said "to be sent" (also) in the conferral of a new use and/or of a new gratuitous gift.

Respondeo: Ad hoc dicunt aliqui, quod gratiam augeri est dupliciter, scilicet *perceptibiliter* et *imperceptibiliter*. Si *perceptibiliter*, tunc dicunt, in tali augmento dari vel mitti Filium et Spiritum sanctum; si autem *imperceptibiliter*, tunc dicunt, ipsum non mitti. Et ratio huius est, quia tunc dicitur dari vel mitti, cum mente percipitur.

I respond: To this some say, that "that grace be enlarged" is in a twofold manner, namely *perceptibly* and *imperceptibly*. If *perceptibly*, then they say, that in such an augment the Son and the Holy Spirit are given and/or sent; but if *imperceptibly*, then they say, that (Each) is not sent. And the reason for this is, that then He is said "to be given" and/or "to be sent", when He is perceived with the mind.

Sed aliter potest dici, quod augmentum gratiae est duplicter: aut secundum *profectum* in gratia prius habita et[7] eius usu, aut per *collationem novi usus* vel etiam *doni* gratuiti. Si solum per *profectum*, sicut ostendunt ultimae rationes, non dicitur mitti Spiritus sanctus. Si autem per *collationem novi doni*, sicut fuit in[8] Apostolis in die Pentecostes, vel *novi usus*, sicut est in confirmatione; tunc potest dici mitti vel dari Spiritus sanctus, quia aliquo modo est ibi de novo quantum ad illud donum vel usum doni, et quia abundantius est.

But it can be said in another manner, that an augment of grace is in a twofold manner: either according to *an advance* [profectum] in a grace had beforehand and[7] its use, or through *the conferral of a new use* and/or even of a gratuitous *gift*. If only through a *progress*, just as the last reasons show, the Holy Spirit is not sent. But if through the *conferral of a new gift*, just as there was among[8] the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, and/or *of a new use*, just as is in Confirmation; then the Holy Spirit can be said "to be sent" and/or "to be given", because in He is there anew in another manner as much as regards that given and/or use of the gift, and because He is more abundantly (there).

1. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod non est ibi alio modo essendi; dicendum, quod etsi hoc[9] non sit alio modo essendi, est tamen perfectiori modo inhabitandi et alio modo utendi, et ideo novo modo.

1. To that which is objected, that He is not there in another manner of being [alio modo essendi]; it must be said, that even if according to this[9] He is not (there) in another manner of being, He is, however, by a more perfect manner of indwelling and by another manner of using, and for that reason in a new manner.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur,[10] si abundantius mittitur, abundantius procedit; dicendum, quod mitti abundantius vel procedere est dupliciter: vel *ad hoc*, vel *in hoc*; primo modo uniformiter est mitti, secundo modo non.

2. To that which is objected,[10] 'if He is sent more abundantly, He proceeds more abundantly'; it must be said, that "to be sent and/or proceed more abundantly" is in a twofold manner: either *for this*, and/or *in this*; in the first manner there is a "being sent" in a uniform manner, in the second (there is) not.

---

[1] Libr. I. de Cleric. instit. c. 30: Signatur enim baptizatus cum chrismate per sacerdotem in capitis summitate, per pontificem vero in fronte, ut priori unctione significetur Spiritus sancti super ipsum descensio ad habitationem Deo consecrandam, in secunda quoque, ut eiusdem Spiritus sancti septiformis gratia cum omni plenitudine sanctitatis et scientiae et virtutis venire in hominem declaretur.
[2] A Vat. et cod. cc abest verbum *est*, quod tamen in ceteris mss. et ed. 1 invenitur.
[3] Libr. II. Homil. 10: Cum enim eiusdem Spiritus gratia datur hominibus, mittitur profecto Spiritus a Patre. Cfr. supra p. 242, nota 3.
[4] Praeferendo ed. 1 lectionem, utpote quae ex ipso contextu vera comprobatur, posuimus in hoc argumento ter *consummare* loco *conservare*, quod Vat. cum mss. exhibet.
[5] Ex antiquis mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *illum* pro minus apto *illud*, et paulo ante *quam* loco *et*.
[6] Plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 loco *et* ponunt *eo*, quae tamen lectio et vim obiectionis elidere et responsioni infra positae minus congruere videtur. — Paulo supra post *etiam* codd. L O adiungunt praepositionem *in*.
[7] Vat. cum cod. cc, aliis autem codd. cum ed. 1 obnitentibus, pro *et* ponit *aut*, quo membra distinctionis confunduntur.
[8] Supplevimus ex mss. et ed. 1 *in*.
[9] In codd. variae extant lectiones; nam aliqui codd. ut gg legunt *ibi* pro *hoc*, alii vero ut ff *in hoc*, ed. 1 autem omittit *hoc*; multi tandem *quod si* loco *quod etsi*, licet minus bene.
[10] Nonnulla scripta ut I K P Q V X addunt *quod*.

[1] de Cleric. instit., Bk. I, ch. 30: For the baptized is signed with chrism by means of the priest on the summit of his head, but by means of a pontiff on the forehead, to signify by the first anointing the descending of the Holy Spirit upon him to consecrate a dwelling to God, in the second too, so that by the sevenfold grace of the same Holy Spirit (His) coming into the man might be declared with every fullness of holiness and knowledge.
[2] From the Vatican edition and codex cc there is absent the word *is* [est], which, however, is found in all the other manuscripts and edition 1.
[3] Book II, Homily 10: For when the grace of the same Spirit is given to men, the Spirit is truly sent from the Father. Cf. above p. 242, note 3.
[4] Preferring the reading of edition 1, as that which is confirmed from the true context, we have put in this argument three times *to add together* [consummare] in place of *to conserve* [conservare], which the Vatican edition, together with the manuscripts, exhibits.
[5] From the ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *him* [illum] for the less apt *it* [illud], and a little before this *than* [quam] in place of *and* [et].
[6] Very many codices, together with edition 1, in place of *and* [et] put *for the reason* [eo], which reading, however, seems both to shatter the force of the objection and to be less congruous with the response posited below it. — A little above this after *also* [etiam] codices L and O reads *in a man without knowing it* [in homine nesciente].
[7] The Vatican edition together with codex cc, but with the other codices and edition 1 striving against them, puts *either* [aut] in place of *and* [et], which confounds the members of the distinction.
[8] We have supplied from the manuscripts and edition 1 the *among* [in].
[9] In the codices there are a variety of readings; for some codices, such as gg, read *there* [ibi] for *according to this* [hoc], but others, such as ff, have *in this* [in hoc], moreover edition 1 omits *according to this* [hoc]; just before this many read *that if* [quod si] in place of *that even if* [quod etsi], though less well.
[10] Not a few codices, such as I K P Q V X, by adding *that* [quod] do not require the quotation marks which follow.

---

p. 274

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod quotidie augetur; dicendum, quod quotidie augetur quantum ad fervorem, sed non quantum ad

3. To that which is objected, that (grace) is daily enlarged; it must be said, that it is enlarged daily as regard fervor, but not as

novorum donorum vel usuum collationem.

much as regard the conferral of new gifts and/or uses.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod gratia remissa debet recedere; dicendum, quod, sicut infra patebit,[1] gratia augetur quantum ad substantiam, sed non remittitur nisi solum quantum ad fervorem; Spiritus autem sanctus[2] *mitti* non dicitur in augmento fervoris, sed solum substantiae caritatis.

4. To that which is objected, that with grace given up He ought to withdraw, it must be said, that, just as will be clear below,[1] grace is enlarged as much as regards (its) substance, but is not given up except only as much as regards fervor; moreover the Holy Spirit[2] is not said *to be sent* in the augment of fervor, but only (in the augment) of the substance of charity.

SCHOLION.

I. Sensus quaestionis est, utrum semper mittantur Filius et Spiritus sanctus, quotiescumque dona vel gratia augentur. — Prima opinio, quam S. Doctor nec aprobat nec reprobat, est B. Alberti, Richardi aliorumque. Ipse vero respondet sub alia distinctione et bimebri conclusione, ut patet ex textu. — Verba in solut. ad 1. et ad ult., quae videntur insinuare, quod in omni augmento gratiae sanctificantis sit missio, intelligi debent secundum doctrinam in corp. positam. Sententiam Seraphici sequitur S. Thomas, qui tamen in comment. addit: « Quidam dicunt, quod in omni augmento gratiae gratum facientis sit missio divinae pesonae, quod et sustineri faciliter potest ».

II. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 73. m. 4. a. 3. — S. Thom., hic q. 5. quaestiunc. 2; S. I. q. 43. a. 6. ad 2. — B. Albert., hic a. 19; d. 17. a. 9. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 4. a. 1. quaestiunc. 3. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 4. q. 2. — Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 1 coll. 1. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 3. in fine.

SCHOLIUM

I. The sense of the question is, whether the Son and the Holy Spirit are always sent, howsoever often the gifts and/or graces are enlarged. — The first opinion, which the Seraphic Doctor neither approves nor reproves, is that of Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), Richard (of Middleton) and others. On the other hand, (the Seraphic Doctor) does respond under another distinction and with a twofold conclusion, as is clear from his text. — The words in the solution to n. 1 and to n. 4, which seem to insinuate, that in every augment of sanctifying grace there is a mission, ought to be understood according to the doctrine put forth in the body (of the response). St. Thomas follows the sentence of the Seraphic (Doctor), and adds in his commentary: « Certain ones says, that in every augment of the grace which makes one pleasing there is a mission of a Divine Person, which also can be easily sustained ».

II. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 73, m. 4, a. 3. — St. Thomas, here in q. 5, quaestiuncula 2; Summa., I, q. 43, a. 6, in reply to n. 2. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 19; d. 17, a. 9. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 4, a. 1, quaestiuncula 3. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 4, q. 2. — Giles the Roman, here in 2nd. princ. q. 1, coll. 1. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 3, at the end.

---

[1] Dist. 17. p. II. q. 1. et 3.
[2] Vat., contra codd. et ed. 1 et aliter quam supra in corp. hic legit *Spiritum autem sanctum*. Mox post *fervoris* cod. Y addit *nec in aliquo alio augmento*.

[1] Distinction 17, p. II, qq. 1 and 3.
[2] The Vatican edition, contrary to the codices and edition 1, reads here otherwise than above in the body (of the response): *moreover the Holy Spirit* [Spiritus autem sanctus]. Then after *of fervor* [fervoris] codex Y adds *nor in any other augment* [nec in aliquo alio augmento].

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XV.

PARS II.

DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 274-276.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XV

PART II

DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 274-276.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Dub. I.

In parte ista sunt dubitationes circa litteram, et primo dubitatur de *situ* primi capituli huius partis. Videtur enim, quod Magister non debeat hic ponere tractatum de missione Filii, quia missio Filii est incarnatio, sed de eius incarnatione agetur[3] in tertio: ergo ibi deberet agere de missione, non hic.

Doubt I

In this part are the doubts about the text (of Master Peter), and first there is the doubt concerning the *situation* of the first chapter of this part. For it seems, that Master (Peter) ought not put a tract on the mission of the Son here, because the mission of the Son is the Incarnation, but His Incarnation will be dealt with[3] in the Third (Book): therefore he would have to deal with the mission there, not here.

Respondeo: Dicendum,[4] quod Magister incidenter introducit hic tractatum de missione Filiii propter explicationem missionis Spiritus sancti. Posset tamen dici, quod Magister hic agit de missione Filii in mentem principaliter, sed de missione Filii in carnem per accidens, ut distinguat a missione Filii in mentem. De illa autem

I respond: It must be said,[4] that Master (Peter) introduces incidentally here a tract on the mission of the Son for the sake of explaining the mission of the Holy Spirit. However it could be said, that Master (Peter) deals with the mission of the Son here principally in regard to the mind, but of the mission of the Son in regard to the flesh

missione, quae est in carnem, specialiter et principaliter agit in tertio, et ideo[5] aliter ibi quam hic.

per accidens, to distinguish (it) from the mission of the Son in regard to the mind. But he deals with that mission, which is in regard to the flesh, especially and principally in the Third (Book), and for that reason[5] otherwise than here.

Dub. II.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Non eo ipso, quod de Patre natus est, missus dicitur Filius*. Videtur enim dicere falsum et contra Gregorium,[6] qui dicit: « Eo modo mittitur Filius, quo generatur ».

Doubt II

Likewise is asked of this which he says: *Not for the very reason, that He has been born of the Father, is the Son said (to have been) sent*. For he seems to speak a falsehood and contrary to (St.) Gregory,[6] who says: « The Son is sent in that manner, whereby He is generated »

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod Augustinus loquitur cum praecisione, ut intelligatur: *non eo ipso tantum*; Gregorius autem cum praesuppositione manifestationis. *Vel aliter*: Augustinus loquitur de generatione aeterna, Gregorius de temporali; unde nulla ibi[7] est omnino contradictio.

I respond: It must be said, that (St.) Augustine speaks with precision, so that there be understood: *not only for the very reason*; but (St.) Gregory with the presupposition of a manifestation. *And/or in another manner*: (St.) Augustine speaks of the eternal generation, (St. Gregory) of the temporal; whence there is entirely no contradiction there.[7]

Dub. III.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod *ante incarnationem missus est ad omnes Sanctos, qui ante fuerunt*. Quaeritur ergo, utrum post incarnationem plenius sit datus Filius et Spiritus sanctus. Et quod sic, videtur, quia status Legis fuit status imperfectionis, status Evangelii status perfectionis. Lex enim neminem duxit ad perfectionem,[8] sed Evangelium dicit: *Estote perfecti*, Matthaei quinto:[9] ergo etc.

Doubt III

Likewise is asked of this which he says, that *before the Incarnation He was sent to all the Saints, who were before*. Therefore, it is asked, whether after the Incarnation the Son and the Holy Spirit have been given more fully. And that it is so, it seems, because the state of the Law was a state of imperfection, the state of the Gospel a state of perfection. For the Law lead no one to perfection,[8] but the Gospel says. *Be ye perfect*, in the fifth (chapter of St.) Matthew:[9] ergo etc..

Item, de Spiritu sancto videtur hoc specialiter, quia scribitur Ioannis septimo:[10] *Spiritus nondum erat datus, quia Iesus nondum erat glorificatus*; hoc non dicitur, quod nullo modo ante fuerit datus, sed quia non ita abundanter: ergo etc.

Likewise, this seems specially (true) of the Holy Spirit, because there is written in the seventh (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John:[10] *The Spirit had not yet been given, because Jesus had not yet been glorified*; this is not said, because He had in no manner been given before, but because (He had not been given) so abundantly: ergo etc..

Item, maior cognitio et dilectio est tempore Legis gratiae, quam tempore Legis scriptae: ergo etc.

Likewise, there is a greater cognition and dilection in the season of the Law of grace, than in the season of the written Law: ergo etc..

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod *plenius dari* potest dupliciter intelligi: aut *intensive*, aut *extensive*. Si *extensive*, sic pluribus datus est Spiritus sanctus tempore Legis gratiae,

I respond: It must be said, that "*to be given more fully*" can be understood in a twofold manner. either *intensively*, or *extensively*. If *extensively*, thus the Holy

quia *in omnem terram exivit sonus eorum*[11] etc., non tantum ad unam gentem. Si intesive, hoc est quantum ad *generalem statum*, aut quantum ad *speciales personas*; quantum ad generalem statum in novo Testamento, . . .

Spirit has been given to more in the season of the Law of grace, because *unto every land has their voice gone forth*[11] etc., not only to one nation. If *intensively*, this is as much as regards the *general state*, or as much as regards *special persons*; as much as regards the state in the New Testament, . . .

[3] Adstipulantibus vetustioribus mss. et ed. 1, posuimus *agetur* pro *agitur*. Paulo infra post *non* cod. V satis bene addit *autem*.
[4] Supplevimus ex antiquis codd. et ed. 1 *Dicendum*, et mox substituimus *hic* pro *hunc*.
[5] Ed. 1 *ita* pro *ideo*.
[6] Hom. 26. in Evang. Cfr. p. I. huius d. q. 2. arg. 1. ad opp.
[7] Ad fidem antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *ibi*.
[8] Epist. ad Hebr. 7, 19: Nihil enim ad perfectum adduxit lex.
[9] Vers. 48.
[10] Vers. 39. — Mox unus alterque codex ut A cum ed. 1 *quia* loco *quod*, sed minus bene.
[11] Psalm. 18, 5. — Mox post *hoc est* Vat. addit *dupliciter aut*, quod deest in mss., licet aliqui eorum ut V X Y habeant cum ed. 1 *aut hoc est quantum*.

[3] Supported by the older manuscripts and edition 1, we have put *will be dealt with* [agetur] for *is dealt with* [agitur]. A little below this, at the end of the argument codex V reads sufficiently well *but not here* [non autem hic].
[4] We have supplied from the ancient codices and edition 1 *It must be said* [Dicendum], and then we have substituted *here a* [hic] for *this* [hunc].
[5] Edition 1 has *thus* [ita] for *for that reason* [ideo].
[6] Homilies on the Gospel., Hom. 26. Cfr. p. I of this distinction, q. 2, arg. 1 ad opp..
[7] According to the testimony of the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have inserted *there* [ibi].
[8] Hebr. 7:19 : For the Law brought nothing to perfection [Nihil enim ad perfectum adduxit lex].
[9] Verse 48.
[10] Verse 39. — Then one and the other codex, such as A, together with editino 1, has *because* [quia] in place of *because* [quod], but less well.
[11] Psalm 18:15. — Then after *this is* [hoc est] the Vatican edition adds *in a twofold manner or* [dupliciter aut], which is lacking in the manuscripts, though some of them, such as V X and Y, together with edition 1, have *or this is as much as* [aut hoc est quantum].

quantum ad speciales personas in veteri Testamento; et sic se habent ut excedentia et excessa, quia in veteri Testamento fuerunt aliqui viri Evangelici; et sic procedunt rationes ad utramque partem. In veteri enim[1] Testamento fuerunt aliqui abundantes in sapientia, ut Salomon, aliqui in patientia, ut Iob, aliqui in mansuetundine, ut Moyses, aliqui in fide, ut Abraham, aliqui in devotione, ut David, aliqui in miraculorum operatione,[2] ut Elias.

as much as regards special persons in the Old Testament, and thus they regard themselves [se habent] as things exceeding and things exceeded, because in the Old Testament there were some Evangelical men; and in this manner the reasons for each part proceed. For[1] in the Old Testament there were some abounding in wisdom, as Solomon, some in patience, as Job, some in meekness, as Moses, some in faith, such as Abraham, some in devotion, as David, some in the working of miracles,[2] such as Elijah.

Dub. IV.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, *quod missus est ad Angelos*. Videtur enim falsum, quia Angelus dicitur nuntius seu missus: sed ad missum non est missio: ergo etc. *Si tu dicas*, quod alio modo mittiur; *contra*: qui semper est praesens

Doubt IV

Likewise is asked of this which he says, *that He has been to the Angels*. For it seems false, because an Angel is said (to be) a "messenger" or "one sent": but to one "sent" there is not a sending [missio]: ergo etc.. *If you say*, that He is sent in another

non indiget missione; sed Angelus semper contemplatur Deum ut praesentem: ergo etc.

manner: *on the contrary*: He who is always present does not need a being-sent [missione]; but an Angel always contemplates God as One present: therefore etc..

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod missio Sapientiae sive Filii est ad creaturam illustrandam, sicut missio Spiritus sancti ad creaturam sanctificandam. Et quoniam Angeli nec ex se fuerunt sapientes nec ex se fuerunt sancti, ideo oportuit, quod a principio mitteretur eis Sapientia, quae est Filius, et etiam[3] Spiritus sanctus. Unde Augustinus[4] loquitur pro statu glorificationis, proprie autem non dicitur mitti nunc, nisi dicatur large mitti ad manifestationem alicuius occulti.[5]

I respond: It must be said, that the mission of Wisdom or of the Son is to illumine [illustrandam] the creature, just as the mission of the Holy Spirit (is) to sanctify (it). And since the Angels of themselves were not wise nor were of themselves holy, for that reason it was necessary [oportet], that from the beginning there would be sent to them the Wisdom, which is the Son, and also[3] the Holy Spirit. Whence (St.) Augustine[4] speaks of the state of glorification, but properly He is not said to be sent then, except (when) He is said broadly to be sent for the manifestation of something hidden.[5]

Dub. V.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Secundum quod aliquid aeternum mente capimus, non hoc mundo sumus*. Videtur enim falsum dicere, quia aut hoc[6] dicit secundum *animam*, aut secundum *carnem*. Non secundum *carnem*, hoc constat: ergo secundum *animam*: ergo videtur, quod anima, quando Deum cognoscit, sit in caelo sive extra mundum. Item hoc videtur ratione, quia capere aeternum, est magis capi: ergo si quod capitur a capiente locatur, ergo anima locatur in aeternitate, ergo extra tempus. *Praeterea*, quod cognoscitur et amatur, aut trahitur ad cognoscentem et amantem, aut e converso;[7] sed dum Deum amamus et cognoscimus, non trahimus Deum ad nos, sed nos ad Deum, sicut dicitur in quarto de Divinis Nominibus:[8] ergo etc.

Doubt V

Likewise is asked of this which he says: *According to which we grasp anything eternal with the mind, we are not in this world*. For he seems to say (something) false, because he either says this[6] according to *the soul*, or according to *the flesh*. Not according to *the flesh*, this is established: therefore according to *the soul*: therefore it seems, that the soul, when it cognizes God, is in Heaven or outside of the world. Likewise this seems by reason, because "to grasp (something) eternal" is rather "to be grasped": therefore if what is grasped is located by what is grasping, therefore the soul is located in eternity, therefore outside of time. *Besides*, what is cognized and loved, either is drawn to the one cognizing and loving, or the other way around;[7] but while we love God and cognize Him, we do not draw God to us, but ourselves to God, just as is said in the fourth (book) On the Divine Names:[8] therefore etc..

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod locus habet naturam continentis et quietantis.[9] Esse ergo in hoc mundo est dupliciter: aut quantum ad *veritatem* et continentiam, aut quantum ad *quietem*. Augustinus autem loquitur non primo[10] modo, quod anima et corpus *vere* egrediantur hunc mundum, dum mente capit Deum, sed intelligit quantum ad *qutetem*, quia affectus animae non requiescit in temporalibus, quibus

I respond: It must be said, that a location [locus] has the nature of one containing and of one quieting.[9] Therefore, "to be in this world" is in a twofold manner: either as much as regards *the truth* and being-contained [continentiam], or as much as regards *quiet*. But (St.) Augustine does not say in the first[10] manner, that the soul and body *truly* step forth from this world, when the mind grasps God, but understands (this)

superfertur, sed in aeternis,[11] et quantum ad hoc intelligit Dionysius. — Et secunda ratio intelligitur, quod amatum trahit, non localiter mutando, sed sibi conformando, quia amans transformatur in amatum, et cognoscens conformatur cognito.[12]

as much as regards *quiet*, because the affection of the soul does not rest in the temporal (things), upon which it bears itself, but in the eternal ones,[11] and (St.) Dionysius (the Areopagite) understands (it) as much as regard this. — And the second reason is understood (to be), that the one loved draws, not by changing locally, but by conforming to itself, because the one loving is transformed into the one loved, the one cognizing is conformed to the one cognized.[12]

Dub. VI.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit Augustinus: *Pater est principium totius Divinitatis, vel si melius dicitur, Deitatis*. Videtur enim male dicere, quia aut hoc est per generationem, aut per spirationem. Sed si hoc. ergo Pater generat vel spirat Deitatem, quod est contra Magistrum, supra distinctione quinta,[13] ubi dicit, quod essentia nec generat nec generatur. — *Praeterea* quaeritur, quare dicit: « Vel si melius dicitur Deitatis » ?

Doubt VI

Likewise is asked of this which (St.) Augustine says: *the Principle of the whole Divinity, and/or if it is better said, of the Deity*. For he seems to speak badly, because either this is through the generation, or through the spiration. But if in this manner: therefore the Father generates and/or spirates the Deity, which is contrary to Master (Peter), above in the Fifth Distinction,[13] where he says, that the Essence neither generates nor is generated. — *Moreover* there is asked, for what reason does he say: « And/or if it is better said, of the Deity »?

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod Augustinus non . . .

I respond: It must be said, that (St.) Augustine does not . . .

[1] Vat. cum cod. cc minus bene omittit *enim*, quod tamen exstat in aliis codd. et ed. 1.
[2] Vat. *opere* pro *operatione*, sed castigatur ope mss. et ed. 1. — Quaestionem hic propositam invenies fusius pertractatam apud Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 73. m. 2. a. 4. — S. Thom., hic q. 5. a. 2. — B. Albert., hic a. 18. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 4. a. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 5. q. 1. — Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 2. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 5.
[3] In Vat. et cod. cc incongrue deest *etiam*, quod in ceteris codd. et ed. 1 invenitur.
[4] Libr. IV. de Trin. c. 20. n. 27, ex quo textus huius dubi sumtus est; vide lit. Magistri, c. 8.
[5] De hoc specialiter agunt Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 73. m. 3. a. 2. — S. Thom., hic q. 5. a. 1 quaestiunc. 3. — B. Albert., hic a. 19. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 4. a. 1. quaestiunc. 2. — Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 1. collat. 2. — Dionys. Carth., hic a. 5. q. 1.
[6] Supplevimus fide vetustiorum mss. et ed. 1 *hoc*.
[7] Quoad primam partem huius propositionis sequimur lectionem multorum mss. ut F G H I K N T X Y Z dd ee ff, dum Vat. falso habet *quod cognoscit et amat*, et ed. 1 *quod cognoscitur et amat*. Quoad secundam vero partem exhibemus lectionem cod. Y, quae et in se distinctior est et cum subnexis concordat, a qua non multum dissidet lectio cod. M *trahitur ad cognoscentem et in amatum*, pro quo maior pars mss. cum ed. 1 *trahitur a cognoscente in*

[1] The Vatican edition less well, together with codex cc, omits *For* [enim], which however is extant in the other codices and edition 1.
[2] The Vatican edition reads *work* [opere] for *working* [operatione], but is corrected with the help of the manuscripts and edition 1. — This proposed question will be found more fully treated in Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 73, m. 2, a. 4. — St. Thomas, here in q. 5, a. 2. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 18. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 4, q. 2. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 5, q. 1. — Giles the Roman, here in 2nd. princ., q. 2. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 5.
[3] In the Vatican edition and codex cc there is incongruously lacking *also* [etiam], which is found in all the other codices and in edition 1.
[4] On the Trinity., Bk. IV, ch. 20, n. 27, from which the text of this doubt has been taken, see the text of Master (Peter), here in ch. 8.
[5] This is especially treated in Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 73, m. 3, a. 2. — St. Thomas, here in q. 5, a. 1, quaestiuncula 3. Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 19. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 4, a. 1, quaestiuncula 2. — Giles the Roman, here in 2nd princ., q. 1, collation 2. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in a. 5, q. 1.
[6] We have supplied, trusting in the older

amantem, Vat. autem cum aliquibus codd. *trahitur a cognoscente et amante*. — Mox ed. 1 *cum* loco *dum*, et paulo infra post *sed nos* in cod. dd additur *trahimur*.

[8] Cap. 3 § 1: Non ut trahentes ubique praesentem, et nusquam virtutem, sed ut memoriis et invocationibus nosmetipsos iniungentes ei et adunantes.

[9] Cfr. Aristot., IV. Phys. text. 41. et 48. (c. 4. et 5.).

[10] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 *proprio* loco *primo*, sicuti et mox contra plures vetustiores codd. ut A G T Z dd *egrediatur* pro *egrediantur*.

[11] Mss. cum quinque primis edd. transponunt verba *sed aeternis* post *in temporalibus*, sed minus bene, eo quod verba immediate sequentia *quibus superfertur* tunc in sensu parum usitato accipienda essent, scil in hoc: *per quae affectus fertur super temporalia*, qui non concordat cum modo loquendi alias a S. Doctore usurpato respectu huius verbi *superferri*, cfr. infra d. 17, p. I. dub. 5, ubi habetur *superferri passionibus*. — Mox Vat. absque auctoritate codd. et ed. 1 *intelligitur* pro *intelligit*.

[12] Eadem Augustini verba exponunt S. Thom., hic q. 5. a. 3. — B. Albert., hic a. 20. — Petr. a Tar. et Richard., hic circa lit. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 5. in fine.

[13] Cap. 1. — Paulo ante ed. 1 *et* loco *vel*.

manuscripts and edition 1, *this* [hoc].

[7] In regard to the first part of this proposition, we follow the reading of many manuscripts, such as F G H I K N T X Y Z dd ee and ff, while the Vatican falsely has *what cognizes and loves* [quod cognoscit et amat], and edition 1 has *what is cognized and loves* [quod cognoscitur et amat]. In regard to the second part, however, we exhibit the reading of codex Y, which is both in itself more distinct and concordant with what follows, from which the reading of codex M does not dissent too much, *is drawn to the one cognizing and into the one loving* [trahitur ad cognoscentem et in amatum], in place of which a greater part of the manuscripts together with edition 1 have *is drawn by the one cognizing into the one loving* [trahitur a cognoscente in amantem], but the Vatican edition together with other codices has *is drawn from the one cognizing and loving* [trahitur a cognoscente et amante]. — Then edition 1 has *when* [cum] in place of *while* [dum], and a little below this after *but* [sed] codex dd reads *we are drawn* [nos trahimur].

[8] (St. Dionysius the Areopagite ibid.,) Chapter 3, § 1: Not that we are drawing the One present everywhere, and never the virtue, but that by memories and invocations we are attaching and uniting ourselves with Him.

[9] Cf. Aristotle, Physics, Bk. IV, texts 41 and 48 (chs. 4 and 5).

[10] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3 and 6, has *a proper* [proprio] for *the first* [primo], just as also next, contrary to very many older codices, such as A G T Z and dd, it has *steps forth from* [egrediatur] for *step forth from* [egrediantur].

[11] The manuscripts together with five first editions transpose the words *but in (the) eternal ones* [sed in aeternis] after *in the temporal (things)* [in temporalibus], but less well, for the reason that the words immediately following *upon which it bears itself* [quibus superfertur] then would have to be accepted in a sense rarely used, that is in this manner: *through which the affection is brought above temporal things*, which is not concordant with the manner of speaking used by the Seraphic Doctor in respect to this verb superferri [to bear, bring, or carry, up or over or above], cf. below d. 17, p. I, dubium 5, where there is had *bear one's self above one's passions* [superferri passionibus]. — Then the Vatican edition, without the authority of the codices and edition 1, has *is understood* [intelligitur] for *understands (it)* [intelligit].

[12] St. Thomas expounds the same words of (St.) Augustine, here in q. 5, a. 3. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 20. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise and Richard (of Middleton), here on the text (of Master Peter). — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 5, at the end.

[13] Chapter 1. — A little before this edition 1 has *and* [et] for *and/or* [vel].

_p. 276_

simpliciter dicit, quod sit principium say simply, that He is the Principle of the

Divinitatis, sed cum hac determinatione, *totius*. Et quoniam in simplicissimo non cadit aliqua totalitas, nisi extenso nomine totalitatis ad pesonarum pluralitatem, ideo Deitas sive Divinitas stat ut in personis; tamen quia non potest trahi ad personas, cum sit nomen abstractum, praedictus sermo exponendus est, sicut supra[1] exponit Magister locutiones consimiles.

Divinity, but with this determination, "*of the whole*" (Divinity). And since in the most simple there does occur any totality, except when the name "totality" is extended to a plurality of persons, for that reason "Deity" or "Divinity" stands as "among the Persons"; however, because ("totality") cannot be drawn to the Persons, since it is an abstract noun, the aforesaid saying must be expounded, just as Master (Peter) expounds completely similar sayings above.[1]

Quod quaeritur: quare dicitur *Deitatis* melius? dicendum, quod *divinum* potest dici de creaturis, secundum quod dicitur homo *divinus*; sed Deus solius Dei est proprium; ideo *Deitas* magis proprie dicit formam Dei quam *Divinitas*; ideo melius dicitur *Deitatis* quam *Divinitatis*.

Because there is asked: for what reason is there said "better *of the Deity*"? it must be said, that *divine* can be said of creatures, according to which a man is said (to be) "*a divine*"; but "God" is proper to God alone; for that reason "*Deity*" more properly means the form of God than "*Divinity*"; for that reason there is better said "*Deity*" than "*Divinity*".

[1] Dist. V. c. 1 et 2.

[1] Distinction V, chs. 1 and 2.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.